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National Records Center
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
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Celeste Smith
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Washington, DC 20201
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Washington, DC 20530
usms.foia@usdoj.gov

FOIA Officer
Office of Management and Budget
1800 G Street NW
Washington, DC 20503
OMBFOIA@omb.eop.gov
Re: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear Freedom of Information Officers:

Pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, and your agency’s implementing regulations, American Oversight makes the following request for records.

In April 2018, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the United States would adopt a “zero tolerance” policy of separating parents and children arrested while attempting to enter the country illegally.

As of mid-June 2018, the federal government had separated and detained more than 2,000 children, housing many of them in chain-link cages in temporary facilities set up along the border. This harsh and unpopular policy cost American taxpayers millions of dollars, including those spent on the sudden creation of “tent cities,” transport services, and “shelter care” for unaccompanied children. In June, news reports based on Health and Human Services statistics indicated that it cost $775 per child to hold separated migrant children overnight—more than twice the cost of holding them with their parents or in more permanent buildings.

Despite Trump’s executive order in June that “ended” the separation policy after public outcry, as of late August 2018, nearly 500 migrant children were still separated from their parents and remained in U.S. government-funded facilities; two-thirds of these children have parents who were deported earlier this summer.

American Oversight is seeking records to understand the costs to U.S. taxpayers associated with the Trump administration’s policy of separating and detaining children of immigrants arrested at the border.

**Requested Records**

American Oversight requests that your agency produce the following within twenty business days:

1. Records sufficient to identify total costs of crafting and implementing the family separation policy for FY 2018 and FY 2019 (including funds obligated for and reprogrammed to efforts related to the family separation policy in FY 2018, as well as funds requested for FY 2019).

2. Records sufficient to identify the programs from which funds for housing and reuniting children separated from their parents have been diverted, as well as the amount of funding diverted from those programs.

Please provide all responsive records from January 20, 2017, to the date the search is conducted.

The search for responsive records should include all locations and individuals likely to contain responsive records, including at least past and current individuals working within the offices listed in Appendix A, attached to this request.

In addition to the records requested above, American Oversight also requests records describing the processing of this request, including records sufficient to identify search terms used and locations and custodians searched and any tracking sheets used to track the processing of this request. If your agency uses FOIA questionnaires or certifications completed by individual custodians or components to determine whether they possess responsive materials or to describe how they conducted searches, we also request any such records prepared in connection with the processing of this request.

American Oversight seeks all responsive records regardless of format, medium, or physical characteristics. In conducting your search, please understand the terms “record,” “document,” and “information” in their broadest sense, to include any written, typed, recorded, graphic, printed, or audio material of any kind. We seek records of any kind, including electronic records, audiotapes, videotapes, and photographs, as well as letters, emails, facsimiles, telephone messages, voice mail messages and transcripts, notes, or minutes of any meetings, telephone conversations or discussions. Our request includes any attachments to these records. **No category of material should be omitted from search, collection, and production.**

Please search all records regarding agency business. **You may not exclude searches of files or emails in the personal custody of your officials, such as personal email accounts.** Records of official business conducted using unofficial systems or stored outside of official files are subject to
the Federal Records Act and FOIA. It is not adequate to rely on policies and procedures that require officials to move such information to official systems within a certain period of time; American Oversight has a right to records contained in those files even if material has not yet been moved to official systems or if officials have, through negligence or willfulness, failed to meet their obligations.

In addition, please note that in conducting a “reasonable search” as required by law, you must employ the most up-to-date technologies and tools available, in addition to searches by individual custodians likely to have responsive information. Recent technology may have rendered your agency’s prior FOIA practices unreasonable. In light of the government-wide requirements to manage information electronically by the end of 2016, it is no longer reasonable to rely exclusively on custodian-driven searches. Furthermore, agencies that have adopted the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) Capstone program, or similar policies, now maintain emails in a form that is reasonably likely to be more complete than individual custodians’ files. For example, a custodian may have deleted a responsive email from his or her email program, but your agency’s archiving tools would capture that email under Capstone. Accordingly, American Oversight insists that your agency use the most up-to-date technologies to search for responsive information and take steps to ensure that the most complete repositories of information are searched. However, custodian searches are still required; agencies may not have direct access to files stored in .PST files, outside of network drives, in paper format, or in personal email accounts.

Under the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016, agencies must adopt a presumption of disclosure, withholding information “only if . . . disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption”

---

2 See Competitive Enter. Inst. v. Office of Sci. & Tech. Policy, No. 14-cv-765, slip op. at 8 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2016) (“The Government argues that because the agency had a policy requiring [the official] to forward all of his emails from his [personal] account to his business email, the [personal] account only contains duplicate agency records at best. Therefore, the Government claims that any hypothetical deletion of the [personal account] emails would still leave a copy of those records intact in [the official’s] work email. However, policies are rarely followed to perfection by anyone. At this stage of the case, the Court cannot assume that each and every work related email in the [personal account] was duplicated in [the official’s] work email account.” (citations omitted)).
or “disclosure is prohibited by law.” If it is your position that any portion of the requested records is exempt from disclosure, American Oversight requests that you provide an index of those documents as required under *Vaughn v. Rosen*, 484 F.2d 820 (D.C. Cir. 1973), *cert. denied*, 415 U.S. 977 (1974). As you are aware, a *Vaughn* index must describe each document claimed as exempt with sufficient specificity “to permit a reasoned judgment as to whether the material is actually exempt under FOIA.” Moreover, the *Vaughn* index “must describe each document or portion thereof withheld, and for each withholding it must discuss the consequences of disclosing the sought-after information.” Further, “the withholding agency must supply ‘a relatively detailed justification, specifically identifying the reasons why a particular exemption is relevant and correlating those claims with the particular part of a withheld document to which they apply.'”

In the event some portions of the requested records are properly exempt from disclosure, please disclose any reasonably segregable non-exempt portions of the requested records. If it is your position that a document contains non-exempt segments, but that those non-exempt segments are so dispersed throughout the document as to make segregation impossible, please state what portion of the document is non-exempt, and how the material is dispersed throughout the document. Claims of nonsegregability must be made with the same degree of detail as required for claims of exemptions in a *Vaughn* index. If a request is denied in whole, please state specifically that it is not reasonable to segregate portions of the record for release.

**You should institute a preservation hold on information responsive to this request.** American Oversight intends to pursue all legal avenues to enforce its right of access under FOIA, including litigation if necessary. Accordingly, you are on notice that litigation is reasonably foreseeable.

To ensure that this request is properly construed, that searches are conducted in an adequate but efficient manner, and that extraneous costs are not incurred, American Oversight welcomes an opportunity to discuss its request with you before it undertakes a search or incurs search or duplication costs. By working together at the outset, we can decrease the likelihood of costly and time-consuming litigation in the future.

Where possible, please provide responsive material in electronic format by email or in PDF or TIF format on a USB drive. Please send any responsive material being sent by mail to American Oversight, 1030 15th Street NW, Suite B255, Washington, DC 20005. If it will accelerate release of responsive records to American Oversight, please also provide responsive material on a rolling basis.

---

9 *Founding Church of Scientology v. Bell*, 603 F.2d 945, 949 (D.C. Cir. 1979).
11 Id. at 224 (citing *Mead Data Central, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 566 F.2d 242, 251 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).
12 *Mead Data Central*, 566 F.2d at 261.
Fee Waiver Request

In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii) and your agency’s implementing regulations, American Oversight requests a waiver of fees associated with processing this request for records. The subject of this request concerns the operations of the federal government, and the disclosures will likely contribute to public understanding of those operations. Moreover, the request is primarily and fundamentally for non-commercial purposes.

American Oversight requests a waiver of fees because disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of activities of the government. The disclosure of the information sought under this request will document and reveal the operations of the federal government, including the use of taxpayers’ money to enforce the Trump administration’s family separation policy. The public has a profound interest in understanding how the government allocates funds to border enforcement priorities and from where such funds have been diverted. Responsive records will also document the importance placed on enforcement of the family separation policy and the justification for it.

This request is primarily and fundamentally not for commercial purposes, but rather the primary interest is in public disclosure of responsive records. As a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, American Oversight does not have a commercial purpose and the release of the information requested is not in American Oversight’s financial interest. American Oversight’s mission is to promote transparency in government, to educate the public about government activities, and to ensure the accountability of government officials. American Oversight uses the information gathered, and its analysis of it, to educate the public through reports, press releases, or other media. American Oversight also makes materials it gathers available on its public website and promotes their availability on social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter. American Oversight has demonstrated its commitment to the public disclosure of documents and creation of editorial content. For example, after receiving records regarding an ethics waiver received by a senior DOJ attorney, American Oversight promptly posted the records to its website and published an analysis of what the records reflected about DOJ’s process for ethics waivers. As another example, American Oversight has a project called “Audit the Wall,” where the organization is gathering and analyzing information and

commenting on public releases of information related to the administration’s proposed construction of a barrier along the U.S.-Mexico border.\footnote{Audit the Wall, AMERICAN OVERSIGHT, \url{https://www.americanoversight.org/investigation/audit-the-wall}.}

Accordingly, American Oversight qualifies for a fee waiver.

**Conclusion**

We share a common mission to promote transparency in government. American Oversight looks forward to working with your agency on this request. If you do not understand any part of this request, have any questions, or foresee any problems in fully releasing the requested records, please contact Hart Wood at foia@americanoversight.org or (202) 897-3918. Also, if American Oversight’s request for a fee waiver is not granted in full, please contact us immediately upon making such a determination.

Sincerely,

Austin R. Evers
Executive Director
American Oversight
APPENDIX A

The search for responsive records should include all locations and individuals likely to contain responsive records, including at least past and current individuals working within the following offices:

Department of Health and Human Services:

a. The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources, including Acting Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources and Acting Chief Financial Officer Jennifer Moughalian;
b. The Office of Finance within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources, including Sheila Conley, HHS Deputy Chief Financial Officer, and Benjamin Goldhaber, CFO for the Administration for Children and Families;
c. The Office of Budget within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Resources, including Deputy Assistant Secretary Norris Cochran; and
d. The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, including Assistant Secretary for Legislation Matthew Bassett.

Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families

a. The Office of the Director's Budget and Data Analysis section within the Office of Refugee Resettlement; and
b. The Office of Legislative Affairs and Budget.

Department of Homeland Security:

a. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer; and
b. The Office of Legislative Affairs.

Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement:

a. The Office of Management and Administration, including but not limited to Executive Associate Director Staci Barrera;
b. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer; and
c. The Office of Congressional Relations, including but not limited to Assistant Director Raymond Kovacic.

Department of Homeland Security, United States Citizenship and Immigration Services:

a. The office of the Management Directorate, including Acting Associate Director Kevin Kerns;
b. The office of the Chief Financial Officer, including CFO Joe Moore;
c. The office of the External Affairs Directorate, including Acting Associate Director Lora Ries; and

d. The Office of Legislative Affairs within the External Affairs Directorate, including Acting Chief Alan Atkinson and his staff.

Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection:

a. The Office of Finance within Enterprise Services, including Assistant Commissioner Samuel Grable; and
b. The Office of Congressional Affairs, including Assistant Commissioner Pete Ladowicz.

Department of Justice, United States Marshals Service:

a. The Financial Services Division, including Assistant Director H. O’Brien;
b. The Office of Procurement, including Procurement Executive C. O’Brien; and
c. The Office of Congressional and Public Affairs, including Chief W. Delaney.

Department of Justice, Executive Office for Immigration Review:

a. The Office of the Director, including Director James McHenry and Deputy Director Katherine Reilly;
b. The Office of Administration, including Assistant Director Lisa Ward; and
c. The Office of Policy, including Assistant Director Lauren Reid.

Office of Management and Budget

a. The Office of Legislative Affairs;
b. The Office of Budget Review; and
c. The Transportation, Homeland, Justice, and Services Division.